arXiv:1610.04769v1 [math.NA] 15 Oct 2016

Optimal sampling rates for approximating analytic functions from pointwise samples

Ben Adcock
Department of Mathematics
Simon Fraser University
Canada

Rodrigo Platte
School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
Arizona State University
USA

Alexei Shadrin
DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences
University of Cambridge
United Kingdom

October 18, 2016

Abstract

We consider the problem of approximating an analytic function on a compact interval from its values on a grid of $M+1$ points. A recent result (the so-called *impossibility theorem*) has shown that when the points are equispaced, the best possible convergence rate of a stable method is root-exponential in M, regardless of the choice of method, and that any method with faster exponential convergence must also be exponentially ill-conditioned at a certain rate. This result hinges on a classical theorem of Coppersmith & Rivlin concerning the maximal behaviour of polynomials bounded on an equispaced grid. In this paper, we first generalize the lower bound of Coppersmith & Rivlin to arbitrary point distributions. Next, we present an extension of the impossibility theorem valid for general nonequispaced points, and apply it to the case of points equidistributed according to modified Jacobi measures. This leads to a necessary sampling rate for stable approximation from such points. We also prove that this rate is sufficient, and thus are able to quantify exactly (up to constants) the precise sampling rate for approximating analytic functions from such node distributions with stable numerical methods. As an extension, we consider the case where both the function and its first d derivatives are sampled and show that the same sampling rate applies in this setting, at least when the number of derivatives d is fixed. Finally, we discuss the implications of these results for polynomial discrete least-squares approximations. In particular, we theoretically confirm the well-known heuristic that stable approximation using polynomials of degree $N < M$ is possible only once M is sufficiently large for there to be a subset of $N + 1$ of the nodes that mimic the behaviour of the Chebyshev points.

1 Introduction

The concern of this paper is the approximation of an analytic function $f : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{C}$ from its values on an arbitrary set of $M + 1$ points. It is well known that if such points follow a Chebyshev distribution then f can be stably (up to a log factor in M) approximated by its polynomial interpolant with a convergence rate that is geometric in the parameter M. Conversely, when the points are equispaced polynomial interpolants do not necessarily converge uniformly on $[-1, 1]$ as $M \to \infty$; an effect known as Runge's phenomenon. Such an approximation is also exponentially ill-conditioned in M. meaning that divergence is witnessed in finite precision arithmetic even when theoretical convergence is expected.

Many different numerical methods have been proposed to *overcome* Runge's phenomenon by replacing the polynomial interpolant by an alternative approximation (see [18, 19] and references therein). This raises the fundamental question: how successful can such an approximation be? For equispaced points, this question was answered recently in [19]. Therein it was proved that no stable method for approximating analytic functions from equispaced nodes can converge better than root-exponentially fast in the number of points, and moreover any method that converges exponentially fast must also be exponentially ill-conditioned.

A well-known method for approximating analytic functions is polynomial least-squares fitting with a polynomial of degree $N < M$. Although a classical approach, this technique has become increasingly popular in recent years as a technique for computing so-called polynomial chaos expansions with application to uncertainty quantification (see [9, 10, 16, 17] and references therein). A consequence of the impossibility theorem of [19] is that polynomial least-squares is an optimal stable method for approximating one-dimensional analytic functions from equispaced data, provided the polynomial degree N used in the least-squares fit scales like the square-root of the number of grid points $M + 1$.

1.1 Contributions

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the limits of stability and accuracy for approximating analytic functions from arbitrary sets of points. Of particular interest is the case of points whose behaviour lies between the two extremes of Chebyshev and equispaced grids. Specifically, suppose a given set of points exhibits some clustering near the endpoints, but not the characteristic quadratic clustering of Chebyshev grids. Generalizing that of [19], our main result precisely quantifies both the best achievable error decay rate for a stable approximation and the resulting ill-conditioning if one seeks faster convergence.

This result follows from an extension of a classical theorem of Coppersmith & Rivlin on the maximal behaviour of a polynomial of degree N bounded on a grid of M equispaced points [11]. In Theorem 3.1 we extend the lower bound proved in [11] to arbitrary sets of points. We next present an abstract impossibility result (Lemma 4.1) valid for arbitrary sets of points. To illustrate this result in a concrete setting, we then specialize to the case of nodes which are equidistributed with respect to modified Jacobi measures. Such measures take the form

$$\mu(x) = g(x)(1 - x)^\alpha (1 + x)^\beta,$$

where $\alpha, \beta > -1$ and $c_1 \leq g(x) \leq c_2$ almost everywhere, and include equispaced ($\mu(x) = \frac{1}{2}$) and Chebyshev ($\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{1-x^2}}$) nodes as special cases. In our main result, Theorem 4.2, we prove an extended impossibility theorem for such nodes. Similar to [19], two important consequences of this theorem are as follows:

(i) If $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$, any method which converges exponentially fast in M with geometric rate, i.e. the error decays like $\mathcal{O}(\rho^{-M})$ for some $\rho > 1$, must also be exponentially ill-conditioned in M with geometrically growing condition number.

(ii) The best possible convergence rate for a stable approximation is subgeometric with index $\nu = \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$. That is, the error is at best $\mathcal{O}(\rho^{-M^\nu})$ for some $\rho > 1$ as $M \to \infty$.

We also give a full characterization of the trade-off between exponential ill-conditioning and exponential convergence at subgeometric rates lying strictly between $\nu = \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$ and $\nu = 1$.

Although not a result about polynomials per se, this theorem is closely related to the behaviour of discrete least-squares fitting with polynomials of degree $N < M$. Indeed, the quantity we estimate in Theorem 3.1 is equivalent (up to a factor of $\sqrt{M}$) to the infinity-norm condition number of this approximation. By using polynomial least-squares as our method, in Proposition 5.5 we show that the rate described in (ii) is not only necessary for stable recovery but also sufficient. Specifically, when the polynomial degree is chosen as

$$N \asymp M^\nu, \qquad \nu = \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}, \tag{1.1}$$

the polynomial least-squares approximation is stable and converges like $\mathcal{O}(\rho^{-M^\nu})$ for all functions analytic in an appropriate complex region. The fact that such a method is optimal in view of the generalized impossibility theorem goes some way to justify the recent popularity of discrete least-squares techniques in computing polynomial chaos expansions, for example.

In §6 we consider the generalization of the above approximation problem where both f and its first d derivatives are sampled. We prove a Coppersmith & Rivlin-type bound for this extended problem and the corresponding impossibility theorem. Our main conclusion is that sampling both and function and its derivatives leads only to an improvement in the constant in the scaling (1.1), but not the exponent.

Finally, let us note that our results confirm a popular heuristic for polynomial least-squares approximation (see, for example, [8]). Namely, the number of nonequispaced nodes required to stably recover a polynomial approximation of degree N is determined by how many nodes are needed before there exists a subset of size $N+1$ which mimics the distribution of the Chebyshev nodes $\{z_n\}_{n=0}^N$, where $z_n = -\cos(n\pi/N)$. In Proposition 5.6 we show that the same sufficient condition for boundedness of the maximal polynomial also implies the existence of a subset of N of the original $M+1$ nodes which interlace these nodes. In particular, for nodes that are equidistributed according to a modified Jacobi weight function one has this interlacing property whenever the condition $M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)}$ holds, which is identical to the necessary and sufficient condition (1.1) for stability of the least-squares approximation.

2 Preliminaries

Our focus in this paper is on functions defined on compact intervals, which we normalize to the unit interval $[-1, 1]$. Unless otherwise stated, all functions will be complex-valued, and in particular, polynomials may have complex coefficients. Throughout the paper $-1 = x_0 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ will denote the nodes at which a function $f : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{C}$ is sampled. We include both endpoints $x = \pm 1$ in this set for convenience. All results we prove remain valid (with minor alterations) for the case when either or both endpoints are excluded.

We require several further pieces of notation. Where necessary throughout the paper $N < M$ will denote the degree of a polynomial. We write $\|f\|_\infty$ for the uniform norm of a function $f \in C([-1,1])$ and $\|f\|_{M,\infty} = \max_{m=1,\dots,M} |f(x_m)|$ for the discrete uniform semi-norm of f on the grid of points. We write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the Euclidean inner product on $L^2(-1,1)$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ for the Euclidean norm. Correspondingly, we let $\langle f, g \rangle_M = \frac{2}{M+1} \sum_{m=0}^{M} f(x_m)\overline{g(x_m)}$ and $\|f\|_{M,2} = \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle_M}$ be the discrete semi-inner product and semi-norm respectively.

We will say that a sequence a_n converges to zero exponentially fast if $|a_n| = \mathcal{O}\left(\rho^{-n^r}\right)$ for some $\rho > 1$ and $r > 0$. If $r = 1$ then we say the convergence is geometric, and if $0 < r < 1$ or $r > 1$ then it is subgeometric or supergeometric respectively. When $r = 1/2$ we refer to this convergence as root-exponential. Given two nonnegative sequences a_n and b_n we write $a_n \asymp b_n$ as $n \to \infty$ if there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $c_1 b_n \leq a_n \leq c_2 b_n$ for all large n. Finally, we will on occasion use the notation $A \lesssim B$ to mean that there exists a constant $c > 0$ independent of all relevant parameters such that $A \leq cB$.

2.1 The impossibility theorem for equispaced points

We first review the impossibility theorem of [19]. Let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M = \{-1 + 2m/M\}_{m=0}^M$ be a set of $M+1$ equispaced points in $[-1,1]$ and suppose that $F_M : C([-1,1]) \to C([-1,1])$ is a family of mappings such that $F_M(f)$ depends only on the values of f on this grid. Define the (absolute) condition number

$$\kappa(F_M) = \sup_{f \in C([-1,1])} \lim_{\delta \to 0^+} \sup_{\substack{h \in C([-1,1]) \\ 0 < \|h\|_{M,\infty} \leq \delta}} \frac{\|F_M(f+h) - F_M(f)\|_\infty}{\|h\|_{M,\infty}}. \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose that $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a compact set. We write $B(E)$ be the Banach space of functions that are continuous on E and analytic in its interior with norm $\|f\|_E = \sup_{z \in E} |f(z)|$.

Theorem 2.1 ([19]). *Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be a compact set containing $[-1,1]$ in its interior and suppose that $\{F_M\}_{M=1}^\infty$ is an approximation procedure based on equispaced grids of $M+1$ points such that for some $C, \rho > 1$ and $1/2 < \tau \leq 1$ we have*

$$\|f - F_M(f)\|_\infty \leq C\rho^{-M^\tau} \|f\|_E, \qquad M = 1, 2, \dots,$$

for all $f \in B(E)$. Then the condition numbers (2.1) satisfy

$$\kappa(F_M) \geq \sigma^{M^{2\tau - 1}},$$

for some $\sigma > 1$ and all large M.

Specializing to $\tau = 1$, this theorem states that exponential convergence at geometric rate implies exponential ill-conditioning at geometric rate. Conversely, stability of any method is only possible when $\tau = 1/2$, corresponding to at best root-exponential convergence in M.

2.2 Coppersmith & Rivlin's bound

The proof of Theorem 2.1, although it does not pertain to polynomials or polynomial approximation specifically, relies on a result Coppersmith & Rivlin on the maximal behaviour polynomials bounded on an equispaced grid. To state this, we first introduce the notation

$$B(M, N) = \sup \left\{ \|p\|_\infty : p \in \mathbb{P}_N, \|p\|_{M,\infty} \leq 1 \right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that in the special case $M = N$, this is just the Lebesgue constant

$$B(N,N) = \Lambda(N) = \sup\left\{\|F_N(f)\|_\infty : f \in C([-1,1]), \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\right\},$$

where $F_N(f)$ denotes the polynomial interpolant of degree N of a function f.

Theorem 2.2 ([11]). *Let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M = \{-1+2m/M\}_{m=0}^M$ be an equispaced grid of $M+1$ points in $[-1,1]$ and suppose that $1 \leq N \leq M$. Then there exist constants $b \geq a > 1$ such that*

$$a^{N^2/M} \leq B(M,N) \leq b^{N^2/M}.$$

Two key implications of this result are as follows. First, a polynomial of degree N bounded on $M = \mathcal{O}(N)$ equispaced points can grow at most exponentially large in between those points. Second, one needs quadratically-many equispaced points, i.e. $M \asymp N^2$, in order to control the maximal behaviour of a polynomial of degree N bounded on an equispaced grid. We remark in passing that when $M = N$, so that $B(N,N) = \Lambda(N)$ is the Lebesgue constant, one also has the well-known estimate $\Lambda(N) \sim \frac{2^{N+1}}{\mathrm{e}N\log(N)}$ for large N (see, for example, [23, Chpt. 15]).

Remark 2.3 Sufficiency of the scaling $M \asymp N^2$ is an older result, dating back to work Schönhage [21] and Ehlich & Zeller [13, 14] in the 1960s. Ehlich also proved unboundedness of $B(M,N)$ if $M = o(N^2)$ as $N \to \infty$ [12]. More recently, Rakhmanov [20] has given a very precise analysis of not just $B(M,N)$ but also the pointwise quantity $B(M,N,x) = \sup\{|p(x)| : p \in \mathbb{P}_N, \|p\|_{M,\infty} \leq 1\}$.

2.3 Discrete least squares

A simple algorithm that attains the bounds implied in Theorem 2.1 is discrete least-squares with polynomials

$$F_{M,N}(f) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{p\in\mathbb{P}_N} \sum_{m=0}^{M} |f(x_m) - p(x_m)|^2. \tag{2.3}$$

Here $N \leq M$ is a parameter which is chosen to ensure specific rates of convergence. The following result determines the conditioning and convergence of this approximation (note that this result is in valid for arbitrary sets of points, not just equispaced):

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ be a set of M points in $[-1,1]$ and suppose that $1 \leq N \leq M$. If $f \in C([-1,1])$ and $F_{M,N}(f)$ is as in (2.3) then the error*

$$\|f - F_{M,N}(f)\|_\infty \leq (1+\kappa_{M,N}) \inf_{p\in\mathbb{P}_N} \|f-p\|_\infty,$$

where $\kappa_{M,N} = \kappa(F_{M,N})$ is the condition number of $F_{M,N}$. Moreover,

$$B(M,N) \leq \kappa_{M,N} \leq \sqrt{M+1}B(M,N), \tag{2.4}$$

where $B(M,N)$ is as in (2.2). Furthermore, if $M = N$, i.e. $F_N = F_{N,N}$ is the polynomial interpolant of degree N, then

$$\kappa_{N,N} = B(N,N) = \Lambda(N), \tag{2.5}$$

is the Lebesgue constant.

Although this result is well known, we include a short proof for completeness:

Proof. Since $N \leq M$ and the points are distinct, the mapping $F_{M,N}$ is well-defined. Notice that $F_{M,N}$ is linear and a projection onto $\mathbb{P}_N$. Hence

$$\kappa_{M,N} = \sup_{\substack{f \in C([-1,1]) \\ \|f\|_{M,\infty} \neq 0}} \frac{\|F_{M,N}(f)\|_\infty}{\|f\|_{M,\infty}}.$$

Therefore for any $p \in \mathbb{P}_N$, we have

$$\|f - F_{M,N}(f)\|_\infty \leq \|f - p\|_\infty + \|F_{M,N}(f-p)\|_\infty \leq (1 + \kappa_{M,N})\|f - p\|_\infty.$$

It remains to estimate the condition number. Since $F_{M,N}(f)$ is a polynomial, it follows that

$$\kappa_{M,N} \leq B(M,N) \sup_{\substack{f \in C([-1,1]) \\ \|f\|_{M,\infty} \neq 0}} \frac{\|F_{M,N}(f)\|_{M,\infty}}{\|f\|_{M,\infty}}. \tag{2.6}$$

Now observe that

$$\|F_{M,N}(f)\|_{M,\infty}^2 \leq \sum_{m=0}^{M} |F_{M,N}(f)(x_m)|^2 = \frac{M+1}{2}\|F_{M,N}(f)\|_{M,2}^2.$$

Since $F_{M,N}(f)$ is the solution of a discrete least-squares problem it is a projection with respect to the discrete semi-inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_M$. Hence $\|F_{M,N}(f)\|_{M,2} \leq \|f\|_{M,2} \leq \sqrt{2}\|f\|_\infty$. Combining this with the previous estimate gives the upper bound $\kappa_{M,N} \leq \sqrt{M+1}B(M,N)$. For the lower bound, we use (2.6) and the fact that $F_{M,N}$ is a projection to deduce that

$$\kappa_{M,N} \geq \max_{\substack{p \in \mathbb{P}_N \\ \|p\|_{M,\infty} \neq 0}} \frac{\|p\|_\infty}{\|p\|_{M,\infty}} = B(M,N).$$

This completes the proof of (2.4). The result (2.5) is an immediate consequence of definition of $\Lambda(N)$. □

2.4 Examples of nonequispaced points

To illustrate our main results proved later in the paper, we shall consider points $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ that are equidistributed with respect to so-called *modified Jacobi* weight functions. These are defined as

$$\mu(x) = g(x)(1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\alpha, \beta > -1$ and the function $g(x)$ satisfies $c_1 \leq g(x) \leq c_2$ almost everywhere. Throughout, we assume the normalization

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1,$$

in which case the points $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ are defined implicitly as

$$\frac{m}{M} = \int_{-1}^{x_m} \mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \quad m = 0, \ldots, M. \tag{2.8}$$

A special case of the modified Jacobi weight functions are the ultraspherical weight functions, defined as

$$\mu(x) = c(1-x^2)^\gamma, \qquad c = \left(\int_{-1}^{1} (1-x^2)^\gamma \, \mathrm{d}x \right)^{-1}, \tag{2.9}$$

for $\gamma > -1$. Within this class, we shall consider several particular examples:

(U) ($\gamma = 0$) The uniform weight function $\mu(x) = \frac{1}{2}$, corresponding to the equispaced points $x_m = -1 + 2\frac{m}{M}$.

(C1) ($\gamma = -1/2$) The Chebyshev weight function of the first kind $\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{1-x^2}}$, corresponding to the Chebyshev points. Note that these points are roughly equispaced near $x = 0$ and quadratically near the endpoints $x = \pm 1$. That is, $|x_1 + 1|, |x_{M-1} - 1| = \mathcal{O}\left(M^{-2}\right)$.

(C2) ($\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$) The Chebyshev weight function of the second kind $\mu(x) = \frac{2}{\pi}\sqrt{1-x^2}$. Note that the corresponding points are roughly equispaced near $x = 0$, but are sparse near the endpoints. In particular, $|x_1 + 1|, |x_{M-1} - 1| = \mathcal{O}\left(M^{-1/2}\right)$.

Recall that for (U) one requires a quadratic scaling $M \asymp N^2$ to ensure stability. Conversely, for (C1) any linear scaling of $M = cN$ with $c > 1$ suffices (see Remark 3.5). Since the points (C2) are so poorly distributed near the endpoints, we expect, and it will turn out to be the case, that a more severe scaling than quadratic is required for stability in this case.

We shall also consider two further examples:

(UC) ($\gamma = -1/4$) The corresponding points cluster at the endpoints, although not quadratically. In particular, $|x_1 + 1|, |x_{M-1} - 1| = \mathcal{O}\left(M^{-4/3}\right)$.

(OC) ($\gamma = -3/4$) The corresponding points overcluster at the endpoints: $|x_1 + 1|, |x_{M-1} - 1| = \mathcal{O}\left(M^{-4}\right)$.

We expect (UC) to require a superlinear scaling of M with N for stability, although not as severe as quadratic scaling as in the case of (U). Conversely, in (OC) it will turn out that linear scaling suffices, but unlike the case of (C1), the scaling factor c (where $M/N = c$) must be sufficiently large.

3 Maximal behaviour of polynomials bounded on nonequispaced nodes

We now consider an arbitrary set of points $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$. We aim to estimate the maximal behaviour of a polynomial of degree N that is bounded at these points. As in §2.2, we define

$$B(M,N) = \sup\left\{ \|p\|_\infty : p \in \mathbb{P}_N, \ |p(x_m)| \le 1, \ m = 0, \ldots, M \right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Once again we note that $B(N,N) = \Lambda(N)$ is the Lebesgue constant of polynomial interpolation.

3.1 Lower bound for $B(M,N)$

Let $-1 < y_0 < \ldots < y_{N-1} < 1$ be the zeros of the N^{th} Chebyshev polynomial $q(x) = \cos(N \arccos(x))$, given by

$$y_n = -\cos\left(\frac{(2n+1)\pi}{2N}\right), \qquad n = 0, \ldots, N-1. \tag{3.2}$$

The following theorem, our first main result of the paper, is a generalization of the lower bound of Coppersmith & Rivlin (Theorem 2.2) to arbitrary nodes:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $M \geq N \geq 1$ and $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ and suppose that $2 \leq K_- \leq N$ and $2 \leq K_+ \leq N$ are the largest integers such that*

$$0 \geq x_n > y_n, \qquad n = 1, \ldots, K_- - 1, \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$0 \leq x_{M-n} < y_{N-n}, \qquad n = 1, \ldots, K_+ - 1, \tag{3.4}$$

respectively, where the y_n are as in (3.2). If no such integer exists, set $K_- = 1$ or $K_+ = 1$ respectively. If $B(M,N)$ is given by (3.1) and $K = \max\{K_+, K_-\} \geq 2$, then

$$B(M,N) \geq Q(K,N),$$

where

$$Q(K,N) = \frac{\pi}{8}\left(\frac{2N^2}{\pi^2}\right)^{K-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma(K+1/2)^2} \max\left\{\prod_{n=1}^{K_--1}(1+x_n), \prod_{n=1}^{K_+-1}(1+x_{M-n})\right\}. \tag{3.5}$$

If $K = 1$ then we have the trivial bound $B(M,N) \geq 1$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $K = K_-$. Let $q(x) = \cos(N \arccos(x))$ be the N^{th} Chebyshev polynomial and define $p \in \mathbb{P}_N$ by

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{2} q(x) \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \frac{x - x_n}{x - y_n}.$$

We claim that $|p(x_m)| \leq 1$ for $m = 0, \ldots, M$. Clearly, for $m = 0, \ldots, K-1$ we have $p(x_m) = 0$. Suppose now that $K \leq m \leq M$. Then, since $|q(x)| \leq 1$ we have

$$|p(x_m)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \left|\frac{x_m - x_n}{x_m - y_n}\right|.$$

By definition, we have $x_m > x_n$ for $n = 0, \ldots, K-1$. Also, by (3.3),

$$x_m > x_{K-1} \geq y_{K-1} \geq y_n, \quad n = 0, \ldots, K-1,$$

and therefore

$$|p(x_m)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \frac{x_m - x_n}{x_m - y_n}.$$

For $n = 1, \ldots, K-1$ (3.3) gives that $\frac{x_m - x_n}{x_m - y_n} \leq 1$. Also, since $x_m \geq y_{K-1}$ and $y_1 > -1$ we have

$$\frac{x_m - x_0}{x_m - y_0} \leq \frac{y_{K-1} + 1}{y_{K-1} - y_0} = 1 + \frac{1 + y_0}{y_{K-1} - y_0} = 1 + \frac{\sin^2(\pi/(4N))}{\sin(K\pi/(2N))\sin((K-1)\pi/(2N))}$$

Recall that $2t/\pi \leq \sin(t) \leq t$ for $0 \leq t \leq \pi/2$. Hence

$$\frac{x_m - x_0}{x_m - y_0} \leq 1 + \frac{\pi^2}{16K(K-1)} \leq 2.$$

Hence

$$|p(x_m)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \frac{x_m - x_n}{x_m - y_n} \leq 1,$$

as required.

We now wish to estimate $\|p\|_\infty$ from below. Let $x^* = \cos(\pi/N)$ so that $|q(-x^*)| = 1$. Then

$$\|p\|_\infty \geq |p(-x^*)| = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \left| \frac{x^* + x_n}{x^* + y_n} \right|.$$

Notice that $x^* + y_n > 0$ for $n = 1, \ldots, K-1$ and therefore $x^* + x_n > 0$ for $n = 1, \ldots, K-1$ by (3.3). Hence

$$\|p\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{x^* + x_0}{x^* + y_0} \right| \prod_{n=1}^{K-1} \frac{x^* + x_n}{x^* + y_n} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{x^* + x_0}{x^* + y_0} \right| \prod_{n=1}^{K-1} \frac{1 + x_n}{1 + y_n}, \tag{3.6}$$

where in the second step we use (3.3) and the fact that $-y_n < x^* \leq 1$ and $x_n > y_n$. Note that

$$1 + y_n = 2\sin^2\left(\frac{(2n+1)\pi}{4N}\right)^2 \leq \frac{(2n-1)^2\pi^2}{8N^2}.$$

Also

$$\frac{|x^* + x_0|}{|x^* + y_0|} = \frac{1 - x^*}{\cos(\pi/(2N)) - x^*} \geq 1.$$

Hence we deduce that

$$\|p\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{n=1}^{K-1} \frac{8N^2}{(2n-1)^2\pi^2} \right) \left(\prod_{n=1}^{K-1} (1 + x_n) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{8N^2}{\pi^2} \right)^{K-1} \frac{\pi}{4^K \Gamma(K + 1/2)^2} \prod_{n=1}^{K-1} (1 + x_n).$$

from which the result follows. □

3.2 Lower bound for modified Jacobi weight functions

Theorem 3.1 is valid for arbitrary sets of points $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$. In order to derive more informative bounds, we now consider points equidistributed according to modified Jacobi weight functions. For this, we first recall the following bounds for the Gamma function:

$$\sqrt{2\pi} z^{z+1/2} \mathrm{e}^{-z} \leq \Gamma(z+1) \leq \mathrm{e} z^{z+1/2} \mathrm{e}^{-z}. \tag{3.7}$$

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\mu(x) = g(x)(1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta > -1$ and $c_1 \le g(x) \le c_2$ almost everywhere for $c_2 \ge c_1 > 0$. If $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$ then there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\sigma > 1$ depending on α and β such that*

$$B(M,N) \ge C\sigma^\nu, \qquad \nu = \left(N^{2(\gamma+1)}/M\right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}},$$

for all $1 \le N \le M$.

Proof. By definition, the points $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ satisfy

$$\frac{m}{M} = \int_{-1}^{x_m} g(x)(1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Without loss of generality, suppose that $\beta \ge \alpha$. Let m be such that $x_m \le 0$. Then

$$\frac{m}{M} = \int_{-1}^{x_m} g(x)(1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \int_{-1}^{x_m} (1+x)^\beta \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim (1+x_m)^{1+\beta}.$$

Thus

$$1 + x_m \gtrsim \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}, \qquad x_m \le 0. \tag{3.8}$$

We now apply Theorem 3.1 and (3.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned} B(M,N) \ge Q(K,N) &\gtrsim \left(\frac{2N^2}{\pi^2 M^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}}\right)^{K-1} \frac{\Gamma(K)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}}{\Gamma(K+1/2)^2} \\ &\gtrsim \left(\frac{2N^2}{\pi^2 M^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}}\right)^{K-1} \frac{\left((K/2)^{K-1}\mathrm{e}^{1-K}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}}{K^{2K}\mathrm{e}^{2(1-K)}} \\ &= K^{-2}\left(\frac{2^{\frac{\beta}{1+\beta}}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{1+2\beta}{1+\beta}}N^2}{\pi^2 M^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}K^{\frac{1+2\beta}{1+\beta}}}\right)^{K-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where $K = K^-$ and $2 \le K^- \le c_1 M$ is such that $x_n \ge y_n$ for $n = 1, \dots, K^- - 1$.

We next estimate K. From (3.8) we find that $x_n \ge y_n$ provided

$$\left(\frac{n}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}} \gtrsim \frac{n^2}{N^2},$$

or equivalently

$$n \le c\left(\frac{N^{2(\beta+1)}}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+1}} = c\nu,$$

where $c > 0$ is some constant. Hence we require $K \le 1 + c\nu$. Let $0 < d \le c$ be a constant whose value with be chosen later. Note that the result holds trivially if $\nu \le 2/d$. Thus we may assume without loss of generality that $\nu > 2/d$. Set

$$K = 1 + \left\lceil \frac{d}{2}\nu \right\rceil,$$

and notice that $K \leq 1 + 1 + \frac{d}{2}\nu \leq 1 + d\nu \leq 1 + c\nu$, as required. Notice also that $K \geq d\nu/2$ and $K \leq 2d\nu$. Substituting this value for K into (3.9) and using these inequalities now gives

$$B(M,N) \gtrsim \nu^{-2} \left(\frac{2^{\frac{\beta}{1+\beta}} \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1+2\beta}{1+\beta}}}{\pi^2 (2d)^{\frac{1+2\beta}{1+\beta}}} \right)^{d\nu/2}.$$

Since $0 < d \leq c$ can be chosen arbitrarily, we now select d sufficiently small so that the term in brackets is strictly greater than one. This gives $B(M,N) \gtrsim \nu^{-2}\tilde{\rho}^{\nu}$ for some $\tilde{\rho} > 1$. Therefore $B(M,N) \gtrsim \rho^{\nu}$ for suitable $1 < \rho < \tilde{\rho}$ and all sufficiently large ν. To complete the proof we once again recall that the result holds trivially whenever $\nu \leq c$ for some constant c. □

This result shows that if $M = \mathcal{O}(N^{\tau})$ for some $0 < \tau \leq 2(\gamma+1)$ then the maximal polynomial grows at least exponentially fast with rate

$$r = \frac{2(\gamma+1) - \tau}{2\gamma + 1}.$$

In particular, the scaling $M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)}$, $N \to \infty$, is necessary for boundedness of the maximal polynomial. In §5.1 we will show that this rate is also sufficient.

It is informative to relate this result to several of the examples introduced in §2.4. First, if $\gamma = 0$, i.e. case (U), we recover the lower bound of Theorem 2.2. Conversely, for (C2) we have

$$B(M,N) \geq C\sigma^{\sqrt{N^3/M}}.$$

Thus, the cubic scaling $M \asymp N^3$ is necessary for stability. Finally, for the points (UC) we have

$$B(M,N) \geq C\sigma^{(M^{3/2}/N)^2},$$

which implies a necessary scaling of $M \asymp N^{3/2}$. Note that Corollary 3.2 says nothing about the case $-1 < \gamma \leq -1/2$. We discuss the case $\gamma = -1/2$ further in Remark 3.5.

The case of linear oversampling ($M \asymp N$) warrants closer inspection:

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\mu(x)$, C and σ be as in Corollary 3.2 and $c \geq 1$. Then*

$$B(\lfloor cN \rfloor, N) \geq C \left(\sigma^{c^{-\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}}} \right)^N.$$

In particular, the Lebesgue constants $\Lambda(N) = B(N,N)$ satisfy

$$\Lambda(N) \geq C\sigma^N.$$

In other words, whenever the points cluster more slowly than quadratically at one of the endpoints (recall that $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$ in the above result), linear oversampling (including the case $M = N$, i.e. interpolation) necessarily leads to exponential growth of the maximal polynomial a geometric rate. Fig. 1 illustrates this for the cases (U), (C2) and (UC). Interestingly, the case (OC), although not covered by this result, also exhibits exponential growth, provided the oversampling factor is below a particular threshold.



Figure 1: The growth of $B(M,N)$ as a function of M for the node densities (U), (C2), (UC), and (OC). In each case $B(M,N)$ is plotted for $N = M$, $N = 2/3M$, and $N = 1/2M$. The function $B(M,N)$ was computed using a modification of Remez' algorithm.

Remark 3.4 In this paper we are primarily interested in lower bounds for $B(M,N)$, since this is all that is required for the various impossibility theorems. However, in the case of ultraspherical weight functions an upper bound can be derived from results of Rakhmanov. In [20, Thm. 1(a)] it is stated that if $\gamma = \alpha = \beta > -1/2$ then any $p \in \mathbb{P}_N$ which is bounded on a set of M points[1] which are equispaced with respect to the ultraspherical weight function (2.9) satisfies

$$\max_{|x|\leq r} |p(x)| \leq C,$$

for some constant $C = C_r$ independent of p and depending only on r, where $r^2 < 1 - (N/M)^\tau$ and $\tau = \frac{2}{2\gamma+1}$. Remez' inequality now gives that

$$\max_{|x|\leq 1} |p(x)| \leq C T_N(1/r),$$

where T_N is the N^{th} Chebyshev polynomial. Suppose that $N/M \leq 1/2$. Then

$$T_N(1/r) < \left(1/r + \sqrt{1/r^2 - 1}\right)^N < \left(1 + (N/M)^\tau + 2(N/M)^{\tau/2}\right)^N \leq \exp(c(N/M)^{\tau/2} N),$$

for some $c > 0$. Using the definition of τ now gives

$$\|p\|_\infty \leq \tilde{C}\tilde{\sigma}^\nu,$$

for $\tilde{C} > 0$ and $\tilde{\sigma} > 1$, where

$$\nu = \left(\frac{N^{2(\gamma+1)}}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}}.$$

The exponent ν is exactly the same as in the lower bound for $B(M,N)$ (Corollary 3.2). In other words, the two-sided bounds of Coppersmith & Rivlin (see Theorem 2.2) for equispaced nodes extend to nodes equidistributed according to ultraspherical weight functions.

Remark 3.5 Corollaries 3.2 and 3.3 do not apply to the nodes (C1) corresponding to $\alpha = \beta = -1/2$. It is, however, well-known (see, for example, [23, Thm. 15.2]) that

$$\Lambda(N) \sim \frac{2}{\pi}\log(N), \quad N \to \infty.$$

Furthermore, a classical result of Ehlich & Zeller [13] gives that

$$B^*(M,N) \leq \frac{1}{\cos\left(\frac{\pi N}{2M}\right)},$$

where

$$B^*(M,N) = \sup\left\{\|p\|_\infty : p \in \mathbb{P}_N, |p(y_m)| \leq 1,\ m = 1,\ldots,M\right\},$$

and $y_m = \cos\left(\frac{2m-1}{2M}\right)$, $m = 1,\ldots,M$. In particular, this result implies boundedess of $B^*(M,N)$ in the case of linear oversampling, i.e. $M \geq (1+\epsilon)N$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

[1] Rakhmanov's result excludes the endpoints $x = \pm 1$ from this set, whereas in our results we include the endpoints. However as remarked earlier, our main theorems would remain valid (with minor changes) if they were to be excluded.

4 An extended impossibility theorem

For $\theta > 1$, let $E_\theta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be the Bernstein ellipse with parameter θ. That is, the ellipse with foci at ± 1 and semiminor and semimajor axis lengths summing to θ. Given a domain $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, we let $D(E)$ be the set of functions that are analytic on E. The following lemma – whose proof follows the same ideas to that of Theorem 2.1 – shows how the condition number of an exponentially-convergent method for approximating analytic functions can be bounded in terms of the quantity $B(M, N)$ for suitable N.

Lemma 4.1 (Abstract impossibility lemma)**.** *Given points $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$, let $F_M : C([-1,1]) \to C([-1,1])$ be an approximation procedure such that $F_M(f)$ depends only on the values $\{f(x_m)\}_{m=0}^M$ for any $f \in C([-1,1])$. Suppose that*

$$\|f - F_M(f)\|_\infty \leq C\rho^{-M^\tau}\|f\|_E, \tag{4.1}$$

for all $f \in D(E)$, where $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded domain containing $[-1,1]$ and $C > 0$, $\rho > 1$ and $\tau > 0$ are constants that are independent of f and M. If $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies

$$N < \frac{M^\tau \log(\rho) - \log(2C)}{\log(\theta)},$$

where $\theta > 1$ is such that the $E \subseteq E_\theta$, then the condition number $\kappa(F_M)$ defined in (2.1) satisfies

$$\kappa(F_M) \geq \frac{1}{2}B(M,N),$$

where $B(M,N)$ is as in (3.1).

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}_N$. Since p is entire (4.1) gives

$$\|F_M(p)\|_\infty \geq \|p\|_\infty - C\rho^{-M^\tau}\|p\|_E.$$

Also, due to a classical result of Bernstein [7, Sec. 9] (see also [19, Lem. 1]), one has $\|p\|_E \leq \|p\|_{E_\theta} \leq \theta^N\|p\|_\infty$. Hence

$$\|F_M(p)\|_\infty \geq \left(1 - C\theta^N\rho^{-M^\tau}\right)\|p\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{2}\|p\|_\infty.$$

It now follows that

$$\kappa(F_M) \geq \max_{\substack{p\in\mathbb{P}_{N-1} \\ \|p\|_{M,\infty}\neq 0}} \frac{\|F_M(p)\|_\infty}{\|p\|_{M,\infty}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \max_{\substack{p\in\mathbb{P}_{N-1} \\ \|p\|_{M,\infty}\neq 0}} = \frac{1}{2}B(M,N),$$

as required. ∎

In order to demonstrate this result in a concrete setting, we now specialize to the case of points equidistributed with respect to modified Jacobi weight functions. This leads to the following theorem, which the second main result of the paper:

Theorem 4.2 (Impossibility theorem for modified Jacobi weight functions)**.** *For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ be equidistributed according to a modified Jacobi weight function (2.7) with parameters $\alpha, \beta > -1$ (see (2.8)). Let $F_M : C([-1,1]) \to C([-1,1])$ be a family of approximation procedures such that $F_M(f)$ depends only on the values $\{f(x_m)\}_{m=0}^M$ for any $f \in C([-1,1])$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that*

$$\|f - F_M(f)\|_\infty \leq C\rho^{-M^\tau}\|f\|_E, \tag{4.2}$$

for all $f \in D(E)$, where $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded domain containing $[-1,1]$ and $C > 0$, $\rho > 1$ and $\tau > 0$ are independent of f and M. If

$$\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2,$$

and

$$\tau > \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)},$$

then the condition numbers $\kappa(F_M)$ satisfy

$$\kappa(F_M) \geq \sigma^{M^\nu},$$

for some $\sigma > 1$ and all large M, where

$$\nu = \frac{2(\gamma+1)\tau - 1}{2\gamma + 1}.$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 3.2. □

This result is best summarized by the statements in following corollary:

Corollary 4.3. *Consider the setup of Theorem 4.2. If $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$ then the following holds:*

(i) If $F_M(f)$ converges exponentially fast to f with geometric rate for all $f \in B(E)$ (i.e. $\tau = 1$ in (4.2)) then the condition numbers $\kappa(F_M) \geq \sigma^M$ grow exponentially in M with geometric rate.

(ii) The best possible rate of exponential convergence of a stable method F_M is subgeometric with index $\frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$.

Proof. We set $\tau = 1$ (part (i)) or $\tau = \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$ (part (ii)) in Theorem 4.2. □

Note that by setting $\gamma = 0$ (i.e. equispaced points) we recover the original impossibility theorem (Theorem 2.1). It is of interest to note that geometric convergence necessarily implies geometrically large condition numbers, regardless of the endpoint behaviour of the sampling points whenever $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$. Conversely, this result says nothing about points that cluster quadratically or faster at $x = \pm 1$, which corresponds to the case $-1 < \gamma \leq -1/2$. Indeed we shall prove in the next section that geometric convergence is possible in this setting with a stable approximation.

5 Optimality of the approximation rate and discrete least squares

Theorem 4.2 gives a necessary relation between the rate of exponential convergence and the rate of exponential ill-conditioning. For example, as asserted in Corollary 4.3, stable approximation necessarily implies subgeometric convergence with index $\frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$. We now show that there exists an algorithm that achieves these rates: namely, polynomial least-squares fitting. In particular, when the polynomial degree is chosen as

$$N \asymp M^{\nu}, \qquad \nu = \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)},$$

one obtains a stable approximation which converges exponentially with index $\frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$ for all analytic functions.

5.1 A sufficient condition for boundedness of the maximal polynomial

We commence with a sufficient condition for boundedness of the quantity $B(M,N)$:

Lemma 5.1. *Let $-1 = x_0 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ be arbitrary and suppose that $N\zeta < 1$, where*

$$\zeta = \max_{m=0,\ldots,M-1} \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{5.1}$$

If $B(M,N)$ is as in (3.1), then

$$B(M,N) \leq \frac{1}{1-N\zeta}.$$

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}_N$ with $|p(x_m)| \leq 1$, $m = 0,\ldots,M$ and suppose that $-1 \leq x \leq 1$ with $x_m \leq x \leq x_{m+1}$ for some $m = 0,\ldots,M-1$. Then

$$|p(x)| \leq |p(x_m)| + \int_{x_m}^{z} |p'(z)|\,\mathrm{d}z \leq 1 + \sup_{-1\leq z\leq 1} |\sqrt{1-z^2}p'(z)| \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-z^2}}\,\mathrm{d}z.$$

Bernstein's inequality gives that $|\sqrt{1-z^2}p'(z)| \leq N\|p\|_\infty$ for any $-1 \leq z \leq 1$. Hence

$$|p(x)| \leq 1 + N\zeta\|p\|_\infty.$$

Since $-1 \leq x \leq 1$ was arbitrary the result now follows. □

Note that this lemma makes no assumption on the points $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$. The following result estimates the constant ζ for points arising from modified Jacobi weight functions:

Lemma 5.2. *Let μ be a modified Jacobi weight function (2.7) with parameters $\alpha,\beta > -1$. If ζ is as in (5.1), then*

$$\zeta \leq CM^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\gamma)}},$$

where $\gamma = \max\{\alpha,\beta,-1/2\}$ and $C > 0$ is a constant depending on α and β only.

Proof. We consider the following four cases:

(i) $-1 < \alpha,\beta \leq -1/2$,
(ii) $-1 < \alpha \leq -1/2$, $\beta > -1/2$,

(iii) $\alpha > -1/2$, $-1 < \beta \le -1/2$,
(iv) $\alpha, \beta > -1/2$.

Case (i): Suppose first that $-1 < \alpha, \beta \le -1/2$. Then

$$\int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{M}.$$

Hence $\zeta \lesssim 1/M$ in this case.

Case (ii): Now suppose that $-1 < \alpha \le -1/2$ and $\beta > -1/2$. Then

$$\int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} g(x)(1-x)^{\alpha}(1+x)^{-1/2}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Recall from (3.8) that

$$1 + x_m \gtrsim \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta}}, \qquad m = 0, \dots, M,$$

and therefore $1 + x_1 \gtrsim M^{-\frac{1}{1+\beta}}$. For $m = 1, \dots, M-1$ we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} g(x)(1-x)^{\alpha}(1+x)^{-1/2}\,\mathrm{d}x &\le (1+x_m)^{-1/2-\beta} \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} g(x)(1-x)^{\alpha}(1+x)^{\beta}\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= (1+x_m)^{-1/2-\beta}\frac{1}{M} \\
&\le (1+x_1)^{-1/2-\beta}\frac{1}{M} \\
&\lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\beta)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the case $m = 0$. For this, we first notice that $x_1 \le 0$ whenever $M \gtrsim 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_1} g(x)(1-x)^{\alpha}(1+x)^{-1/2}\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \sqrt{1+x_1} \lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\beta)}}.$$

Hence we deduce that $\zeta \lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\beta)}}$ for this case as well.

Case (iii): This is identical to the previous case and thus omitted.

Case (iv): For $m = 1, \dots, M-2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x &\le (1-x_{m+1})^{-1/2-\alpha}(1+x_m)^{-1/2-\beta} \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} g(x)(1-x)^{\alpha}(1+x)^{\beta}\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\le (1-x_{M-1})^{-1/2-\alpha}(1+x_1)^{-1/2-\beta}\frac{1}{M} \\
&\lesssim M^{1-\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)}-\frac{1}{2(1+\beta)}} \\
&\le M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\gamma)}},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the final step we use the fact that $\alpha, \beta > -1/2$. For $m = 0$, recalling that $x_1 \le 0$ for all large M, we have

$$\int_{x_0}^{x_1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \sqrt{1+x_1} \lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\beta)}},$$

and similarly for $m = M-1$, noting that $x_{M-1} \geq 0$ for all large M, we have

$$\int_{x_{M-1}}^{x_M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \sqrt{1-x_M} \lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\alpha)}}.$$

We therefore deduce that $\zeta \lesssim M^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\gamma)}}$ as required. □

This now leads immediately to the follow result:

Proposition 5.3 (Necessary and sufficient condition for boundedness of $B(M,N)$)**.** *For $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ be equidistributed according to a modified Jacobi weight function (2.7) with parameters $\alpha, \beta > -1$. Then $B(M,N) \lesssim 1$ if and only if*

$$M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)}.$$

Proof. We combine Corollary 3.2 and Lemma 5.2. □

Remark 5.4 For equispaced points, the sufficiency of the rate $M \asymp N^2$ is a classical result (see Remark 2.3). More recently, similar sufficient conditions have appeared when the sampling points are randomly-drawn from the measure $\mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$. For example, [10] proves that $M \asymp (N\log(N))^2$ uniformly-distributed points are sufficient for L^2/ℓ^2-stability (note that we consider L^∞/ℓ^∞-stability in this paper), whereas only $M \asymp N\log(N)$ points are required when drawn from the Chebyshev distribution. In the multivariate setting, similar results have been proved in [15, 16] for quasi-uniform measures. Up to the log factors, these are the same as the rate prescribed in Proposition 5.3, which is both sufficient and necessary.

5.2 Application to polynomial least squares

We now apply Proposition 5.3 to show that polynomial least squares achieves the optimal approximation rate of a stable approximation (up to a small algebraic factor in M) specified by the generalized impossibility theorem (Theorem 4.2):

Proposition 5.5. *For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ be equidistributed according to a modified Jacobi weight function (2.7) with parameters $\alpha, \beta > -1$. For $1 \leq N \leq M$, let $F_{N,M}$ be the discrete least-squares approximation defined by (2.3). If*

$$M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)},$$

then

$$1 \leq \kappa(F_{M,N}) \leq C\sqrt{M},$$

and

$$\|f - F_{N,M}(f)\|_\infty \leq \frac{C\sqrt{M}}{\theta-1}\theta^{-M^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}}}\|f\|_{E_\theta},$$

for all $f \in D(E_\theta)$ and any $\theta > 1$, where $C > 0$ is a constant.

Proof. Proposition 2.4 gives $\kappa(F_{M,N}) \leq \sqrt{2}\sqrt{M}B(M,N)$ and

$$\|f - F_{M,N}(f)\|_\infty \leq 2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{M}B(M,N)\inf_{p\in\mathbb{P}_N}\|f-p\|_\infty.$$

The result now follows from Proposition 5.3 and the well-known result $\inf_{p\in\mathbb{P}_N}\|f-p\|_\infty \leq \frac{2}{\theta-1}\|f\|_{E_\theta}\theta^{-N}$ (see, for example, [23, Thm. 8.2]). □

5.3 The mock-Chebyshev heuristic

A well-known heuristic is that stable approximation from a set of $M+1$ points $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ is only possible once there exists a subset of $N+1$ of those points that mimic a Chebyshev grid (see, for example, [8]). We now confirm this heuristic. Let

$$z_n = -\cos(n\pi/N), \qquad n = 0, \ldots, N \tag{5.2}$$

be a Chebyshev grid (note that the z_n are equidistributed according to the Chebyshev measure $\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{1-x^2}}$). Then we have:

Proposition 5.6. *Let $-1 = x_0 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ be arbitrary and suppose that*

$$N\zeta < \pi,$$

where ζ is as in (5.1). Then there exists a subset $\{x_n^*\}_{n=1}^N$ of $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ such that

$$-1 = z_0 < x_1^* < z_1 < x_2^* < \ldots < z_{N-1} < x_N^* < z_N = 1, \tag{5.3}$$

where the z_n are as in (5.2). In particular, if $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ are equidistributed according to a modified Jacobi weight function with parameters $\alpha, \beta > -1$ then there exists such a subset $\{x_n^*\}_{n=1}^N$ whenever

$$M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)}, \qquad \gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta, -1/2\}.$$

Proof. Let $\theta_m = \cos^{-1}(-x_m) \in [0, \pi]$ so that

$$\theta_{m+1} - \theta_m = \int_{x_m}^{x_{m+1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \zeta < \pi/N. \tag{5.4}$$

We now construct a subset $\{\phi_n\}_{n=1}^N \subseteq \{\theta_m\}_{m=0}^M$ such that

$$0 < \phi_1 < \frac{\pi}{N} < \phi_2 < \frac{2\pi}{N} < \ldots < \frac{(N-1)\pi}{N} < \phi_N < \pi.$$

First, let m_1 be the largest m such that $\theta_m < \pi/N$. Set $\phi_1 = \theta_{m_1}$. Next, observe that $\theta_{m_1+1} < \theta_{m_1} + \pi/N < 2\pi/N$. Hence there exists at least one of the $\theta_m's$ in the interval $(\pi/N, 2\pi/N)$. Let m_2 be the largest m such that $\theta_m < 2\pi/N$ and set $\phi_2 = \theta_{m_2}$. We now continue in the same way to construct a sequence $\{\phi_n\}_{n=1}^N$ with the required property. Since the function $\cos^{-1}(-\theta)$ is increasing on $[0, \pi]$ it follows that the sequence $\{x_n^*\}_{n=1}^N$ with $x_n^* = \cos^{-1}(-\phi_n)$ satisfies (5.3). ∎

Recalling Lemma 5.1, we note that the same sufficient condition (up to a small change in the right-hand side) for boundedness of the maximal polynomial (for arbitrary points) also guarantees an interlacing property of a subset of N of those points with the Chebyshev nodes. In particular, if $M, N \to \infty$ with $N\zeta \leq c$, where $c < \pi$, the nodes $\{x_n^*\}_{n=1}^N$ equidistribute according to the Chebyshev weight function $\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{1-x^2}}$. Moreover, for modified Jacobi weight functions the sampling rate that guarantees the existence of this 'mock-Chebyshev' grid, i.e. $M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)}$, is identical to that which was found to be both necessary and sufficient for stable approximation via discrete least-squares (recall Proposition 5.5).

6 Extension to derivative sampling

In this final section we investigate a particular generalization of the problem considered thus far. Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we now consider the approximation of a function $f \in C^d([-1,1])$ from the values

$$f^{(r)}(x_m), \quad m = 0, \dots, M, \ r = 0, \dots, d. \tag{6.1}$$

As in previous sections, $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ is a grid of points in $[-1,1]$ with $x_0 = -1$ and $x_M = 1$. Similar to the previous setting, we introduce the following constant:

$$B_d(M,N) = \sup \left\{ \|p\|_\infty : p \in \mathbb{P}_N, |p^{(r)}(x_m)| \leq 1, \ m = 1, \dots, M, \ r = 0, \dots, d \right\}. \tag{6.2}$$

6.1 Abstract impossibility lemma and polynomial least squares

We shall consider approximation procedures defined as mappings

$$F_M : C^d([-1,1]) \to C([-1,1]),$$

where, for each $f \in C^d([-1,1])$, $F_M(f)$ depends only on the sample values (6.1). We use the standard uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ on the $C([-1,1])$ and on the space $C^d([-1,1])$ we define the norm

$$\|f\|_{d,\infty} = \max_{r=0,\dots,d} \|f^{(r)}\|_\infty.$$

If

$$\|f\|_{M,d,\infty} = \max_{r=0,\dots,d} \max_{m=0,\dots,M} |f(x_m)|,$$

is the corresponding discrete norm, then, analogously to (2.1), we define the absolute condition number of F_M as

$$\kappa(F_M) = \sup_{f \in C^d([-1,1])} \lim_{\delta \to 0^+} \sup_{\substack{h \in C^d([-1,1]) \\ 0 < \|h\|_{M,d,\infty} \leq \delta}} \frac{\|F_M(f+h) - F_M(f)\|_\infty}{\|h\|_{M,d,\infty}}. \tag{6.3}$$

We commence with the direct extension of Lemma 4.1 to this setting (the proof is identical and therefore omitted):

Lemma 6.1 (Abstract impossibility lemma for derivatives)**.** *Given points $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$, let $F_M : C^d([-1,1]) \to C([-1,1])$ be an approximation procedure such that $F_M(f)$ depends only on the values (6.1) for any $f \in C^d([-1,1])$. Suppose that*

$$\|f - F_M(f)\|_\infty \leq C\rho^{-M^\tau} \|f\|_E, \tag{6.4}$$

for all $f \in D(E)$, where $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded domain containing $[-1,1]$ and $C > 0$, $\rho > 1$ and $\tau > 0$ are constants that are independent of f and M. If $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies

$$N < \frac{M^\tau \log(\rho) - \log(2C)}{\log(\theta)},$$

where $\theta > 1$ is such that the $E \subseteq E_\theta$, then the condition number $\kappa(F_M)$ defined in (6.3) satisfies

$$\kappa(F_M) \geq \frac{1}{2} B_d(M,N),$$

where $B_d(M,N)$ is as in (6.2).

Let $N \leq (M+1)(d+1)-1$. We now consider the discrete least-squares approxiamtion $F_M = F_{M,N}$ defined by

$$F_{M,N}(f) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{p \in \mathbb{P}_N} \sum_{r=0}^{d} \sum_{m=0}^{M} \left| f^{(r)}(x_m) - p^{(r)}(x_m) \right|^2. \tag{6.5}$$

The following result is the direct generalization of Proposition 2.4:

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^{M}$ be a set of M points in $[-1,1]$ and suppose that $1 \leq N \leq (M+1)(d+1)-1$. If $f \in C^d([-1,1])$ and $F_{M,N}(f)$ is as in (2.3) then the error*

$$\|f - F_{M,N}(f)\|_\infty \leq (1+\kappa_{M,N}) \inf_{p \in \mathbb{P}_N} \|f-p\|_\infty, \tag{6.6}$$

where $\kappa_{M,N} = \kappa(F_{M,N})$ is as in (6.3). Moreover,

$$B_d(M,N) \leq \kappa_{M,N} \leq \sqrt{(d+1)(M+1)} B_d(M,N), \tag{6.7}$$

where $B_d(M,N)$ is as in (6.2). If $N = (M+1)(d+1)-1$, i.e. $F_M = F_{M,(M+1)(d+1)-1}$ is the Hermite polynomial interpolant of degree M, then

$$\kappa_{M,N} = B_d(M,N) = \Lambda_d(M) = \sup_{\substack{f \in C^d([-1,1]) \\ f \neq 0}} \frac{\|F_M(f)\|_\infty}{\|f\|_{d,\infty}}, \tag{6.8}$$

is the Lebesgue constant.

Proof. The proofs of (6.6) and (6.7) are identical to those in Proposition 2.4, and hence omitted. Consider (6.8). By definition

$$\|f\|_{d,\infty} \geq \|f\|_{M,d,\infty} = \|F_M(f)\|_{M,d,\infty}.$$

Since F_M is a projection onto the space of polynomials of degree $N = (M+1)(d+1)-1$, we have

$$\Lambda_d(M) \leq \sup_{\substack{p \in \mathbb{P}_N \\ p \neq 0}} \frac{\|p\|_\infty}{\|p\|_{M,d,\infty}} = B_d(M,N).$$

Conversely, let $p \in \mathbb{P}_N$ be arbitrary. Then there exists an $f \in C^d([-1,1])$ such that $f^{(r)}(x_m) = p^{(r)}(x_m)$, $m = 0, \ldots, M$, $r = 0, \ldots, d$ and $\|f\|_{d,\infty} = \|f\|_{M,d,\infty}$. Hence

$$\Lambda_d(M) \geq \frac{\|F_M(f)\|_\infty}{\|f\|_{d,\infty}} = \frac{\|p\|_\infty}{\|p\|_{M,d,\infty}}.$$

Since p was arbitrary, we deduce that $\Lambda_d(M) \geq B_d(M,N)$ as required. □

6.2 Lower bounds for $B_d(M,N)$ and an impossibility theorem for derivative sampling

As expected, the constant $B_d(M,N)$ arises in both Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 6.2. As was done earlier in the paper, we now seek a lower bound for $B_d(M,N)$. The following result generalizes Theorem 3.1:

Theorem 6.3. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $M \geq N \geq 1$, and $-1 = x_0 < x_1 < \ldots < x_M = 1$ and suppose that $2 \leq K_- \leq N$ and $2 \leq K_+ \leq N$ are the largest integers such that*

$$0 \geq x_n > y_n, \quad n = 1, \ldots, K_- - 1$$

and

$$0 \leq x_{M-n} < y_{N-n}, \quad n = 1, \ldots, K_+ - 1,$$

where the y_n are as in (3.2). If no such integer exists, set $K_- = 1$ or $K_+ = 1$ respectively. If $B_d(M, N)$ is given by (6.2) and $K = \max\{K_+, K_-\} \geq 2$, then

$$B_d(M, (d+1)N) \geq (\sqrt{2}(d+1)N)^{-2d} Q(K, N)^{d+1},$$

where $Q(K, N)$ is as in (3.5). If $K = 1$ then we have the trivial bound $B_d(M, (d+1)N) \geq 1$.

Proof. We follow the same setup as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Without loss of generality, let $K = K_- \geq 2$ and consider the polynomial

$$P(x) = c(p(x))^{d+1},$$

where

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{2} q(x) \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \frac{x - x_n}{x - y_n},$$

is the polynomial used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 and $c > 0$ is a constant which will be chosen later. Note that $P \in \mathbb{P}_{(d+1)N}$. By construction

$$P^{(r)}(x_m) = 0, \quad m = 0, \ldots, K-1, \ r = 0, \ldots, d.$$

Now suppose that $m = K, \ldots, M$. Then by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |P^{(r)}(x_m)| &\leq \sup_{x_{K-1} \leq x \leq 1} |P^{(r)}(x)| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2(d+1)^2 N^2}{1 - x_{K-1}} \right)^r \sup_{x_{K-1} \leq x \leq 1} |P(x)| \\ &\leq c(\sqrt{2}(d+1)N)^{2d} \sup_{x_{K-1} \leq x \leq 1} |p(x)|^{d+1}, \end{aligned}$$

since $x_{K-1} \leq 0$ by assumption. We now claim that $|p(x)| \leq 1$ for $x_{K-1} \leq x \leq 1$. Indeed, since $x > x_{K-1} > y_{K-1}$ we have

$$|p(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \left| \frac{x - x_n}{x - y_n} \right| = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{n=0}^{K-1} \frac{x - x_n}{x - y_n}.$$

The condition $x_n > y_n$ for $n = 1, \ldots, K-1$ gives that $\frac{x - x_n}{x - y_n} \leq 1$ for $n = 1, \ldots, K-1$. For $n = 0$, we note that $x > y_{K-1}$ and $y_1 > -1$ and therefore

$$\frac{x - x_0}{x - y_0} \leq \frac{y_{K-1} + 1}{y_{K-1} - y_0} \leq 2,$$

where in the final inequality we argue as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. This now completes the proof of the claim.

With this in hand, we have

$$|P^{(r)}(x_m)| \le c(\sqrt{2}(d+1)N)^{2d}, \quad m = 1, \dots, K, \ r = 0, \dots, d,$$

and so we now pick the constant c as $c = (\sqrt{2}(d+1)N)^{-2d}$. The result then follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1, after noting that $\|P\|_\infty = c\|p\|_\infty^{d+1}$. □

Remark 6.4 The factor $((d+1)N)^{2d}$ in the above bound comes from the repeated application of Markov's inequality

$$\|p'\|_\infty \le N^2\|p\|_\infty, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{P}_N,$$

for the first derivative of a polynomial (note that P has degree $(d+1)N$). It could be improved by applying Markov's inequality for the r^{th} derivative

$$\|p^{(r)}\|_\infty \le T_N^{(r)}(1)\|p\|_\infty, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{P}_N.$$

See, for example, [22]. However, Theorem 6.3 will be used exclusively to establish exponential growth of $B_d(M, (d+1)N)$ in the regime where $N \to \infty$ and d is fixed (see below), so we opt for a somewhat simpler bound.

We now consider the case of nodes distributed according to the modified Jacobi weight function:

Corollary 6.5. *Let $\mu(x) = g(x)(1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta > -1$ and $c_1 \le g(x) \le c_2$ almost everywhere for $c_2 \ge c_1 > 0$. Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and let $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$. Then*

$$B_d(M, N) \ge C(2N^2)^{-d}\sigma^\nu, \qquad \nu = \left(M^{-1}\left(\frac{N-d}{d+1}\right)^{2(\gamma+1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}}$$

for all $M \ge N \ge d+1$, where $C > 0$ and $\sigma > 1$ are as in Corollary 3.2. In particular, the Lebesgue constants $\Lambda_d(M)$ defined in (2.5) satisfy

$$\Lambda_d(M) \ge C\left(\sqrt{2}(M+1)(d+1)\right)^{-2d}\sigma^{(M-1)(1-1/M)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}}},$$

and in particular, for any $0 < \epsilon < \sigma$, one has $\Lambda_d(M) \ge C(\sigma-\epsilon)^M$ for all sufficiently large M.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the largest integer such that $N \ge (d+1)n$. Then, by Theorem 6.3,

$$B_d(M, N) \ge B_d(M, (d+1)n) \ge (\sqrt{2}(d+1)n)^{-2d}Q(K, n)^{d+1},$$

where K is as defined in the theorem. The proof of Corollary 3.2 gives the lower bound

$$Q(K, n) \gtrsim C\sigma^{\nu'}, \qquad \nu' = \left(n^{2(\gamma+1)}/M\right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}},$$

and therefore

$$B_d(M, N) \gtrsim (\sqrt{2}(d+1)n)^{-2d}C\sigma^{\nu'} \ge C(2N^2)^{-d}\sigma^{\nu'}.$$

To complete the proof we note that $n \ge \frac{N-d}{d+1}$ and therefore $\nu' \ge \nu$. □

This result implies that the scaling $M \asymp (N/(d+1))^{2(\gamma+1)}$ is necessary for stability, which, besides the factor of d, is exactly as in the derivative-free case. In other words, derivative sampling, while it can affect the constant, cannot improve the exponent of the scaling.

With this bound in hand, we can now present an impossibility theorem for derivative sampling (the proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.2, and is hence omitted):

Theorem 6.6. *For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\{x_m\}_{m=0}^M$ be equidistributed according to a modified Jacobi weight function (2.7) with parameters $\alpha, \beta > -1$ (see (2.8)). Let $F_M : C^d([-1,1]) \to C([-1,1])$ be a family of approximation procedures such that $F_M(f)$ depends only on the values (6.1) for any $f \in C^d([-1,1])$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that*

$$\|f - F_M(f)\|_\infty \leq C\rho^{-M^\tau}\|f\|_E, \tag{6.9}$$

for all $f \in D(E)$, where $E \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded domain containing $[-1,1]$ and $C > 0$, $\rho > 1$ and $\tau > 0$ are independent of f and M. If $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$ and $\tau > \frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}$ then the condition numbers $\kappa(F_M)$ defined by (6.3) satisfy

$$\kappa(F_M) \geq \sigma^{c_d M^\nu}, \qquad c_d = (d+1)^{-\left(1+\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}\right)},$$

for some $\sigma > 1$ independent of d and all large M, where

$$\nu = \frac{2(\gamma+1)\tau - 1}{2\gamma+1}.$$

This result demonstrates that sampling a function and its derivatives can at best lead to a limited improvement over sampling the function only. Indeed, the rate of exponential ill-conditioning is identical to that of Theorem 4.2. The only possible improvement is in the constant σ^{c_d}, which is decreasing for increasing d.

7 Concluding remarks

We have presented a generalized impossibility theorem for approximating analytic functions from $M+1$ nonequispaced points. This follows from a new lower bound for the maximal behaviour of a polynomial of degree N that is bounded at these points. By specializing to the case of modified Jacobi weight functions, we have derived explicit relationships between the parameter $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta, -1/2\}$, the rate of exponential convergence and the rate of exponential ill-conditioning. Polynomial least-squares using a polynomial of degree N transpires to be an optimal stable method in view of this theorem. In particular, the sampling rate $M \asymp N^{2(\gamma+1)}$, where $\gamma = \max\{\alpha, \beta, -1/2\}$ is both sufficient and necessary for stable approximation with optimal convergence.

There are a number of directions for future investigation. First, we have only derived an upper bound for $B(M,N)$ in the case of ultraspherical weight functions (see Remark 3.4). We expect the techniques of [20] can be extended to the modified Jacobi case whenever $\max\{\alpha, \beta\} > -1/2$. Second, we have observed numerically that there is an exponential blow-up for $B(M,N)$ in the case $-1 < \gamma < -1/2$ when $M = cN$ for some $c > 0$ below a critical threshold. This remains to be proven. Third, we have mentioned in passing recent results on sufficient sampling rates when drawing random points from measures $\mu(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$ associated with

modified Jacobi weight functions. It would be interesting to see if the techniques used in the paper could also establish the necessity (in probability) of those rates. Fourth, the extension of our results to analytic functions of two or more variables remains an open problem. Fifth, we note in passing that there is a related impossibility theorem for approximating analytic functions from their Fourier coefficients [4] (this is analogous to equispaced samples). The extension to nonharmonic Fourier samples may now be possible using the techniques of this paper. Note that necessary and sufficient sampling conditions for this problem have been proven in [3] and [1, 2] respectively.

Finally, we remark the following. The impossibility theorems proved here and originally in [19] assert the lack of existence of stable numerical methods with rapid convergence. They say nothing about methods for which the error decays only down to some finite tolerance. If the tolerance can be set on the order of machine epsilon, the limitations of such methods in relation to methods which have theoretical convergence to zero may be of little consequence in finite precision calculations. Several methods with this behaviour have been developed in previous works [5, 6]. The existence (or lack thereof) of impossibility results in this finite setting is an open question.

References

[1] B. Adcock, M. Gataric, and A. C. Hansen. On stable reconstructions from nonuniform Fourier measurements. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 7(3):1690–1723, 2014.

[2] B. Adcock, M. Gataric, and A. C. Hansen. Recovering piecewise smooth functions from nonuniform Fourier measurements. In R. M. Kirby, M. Berzins, and J. S. Hesthaven, editors, *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Spectral and High Order Methods*, 2015.

[3] B. Adcock, M. Gataric, and J. L. Romero. Computing reconstructions from nonuniform Fourier samples: Universality of stability barriers and stable sampling rates. *arXiv:1606.07698*, 2016.

[4] B. Adcock, A. C. Hansen, and A. Shadrin. A stability barrier for reconstructions from Fourier samples. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52(1):125–139, 2014.

[5] B. Adcock, D. Huybrechs, and J. Martín-Vaquero. On the numerical stability of Fourier extensions. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 14(4):635–687, 2014.

[6] B. Adcock and R. Platte. A mapped polynomial method for high-accuracy approximations on arbitrary grids. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 54(4):2256–2281, 2016.

[7] S. Bernstein. *Sur l'Ordre de la Meilleure Approximation des Fonctions Continues par des Polynomes de Degré Donné*. Mém. Acad. Roy. Belg., 1912.

[8] J. Boyd and F. Xu. Divergence (Runge phenomenon) for least-squares polynomial approximation on an equispaced grid and mock-Chebyshev subset interpolation. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 210(1):158–168, 2009.

[9] A. Chkifa, A. Cohen, G. Migliorati, F. Nobile, and R. Tempone. Discrete least squares polynomial approximation with random evaluations-application to parametric and stochastic elliptic pdes. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 49(3):815–837, 2015.

[10] A. Cohen, M. A. Davenport, and D. Leviatan. On the stability and accuracy of least squares approximations. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 13:819–834, 2013.

[11] D. Coppersmith and T. Rivlin. The growth of polynomials bounded at equally spaced points. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 23:970–983, 1992.

[12] H. Ehlich. Polynome zwischen Gitterpunkten. *Math. Zeit.*, 93:144–153, 1966.

[13] H. Ehlich and K. L. Zeller. Schwankung von Polynomen zwischen Gitterpunkten. *Math. Zeit.*, 86:41–44, 1964.

[14] H. Ehlich and K. L. Zeller. Numerische Abschätzung von Polynomen. *Z. Agnew. Math. Mech.*, 45:T20–T22, 1965.

[15] G. Migliorati. *Polynomial approximation by means of the random discrete L^2 projection and application to inverse problems for PDEs with stochastic data*. PhD thesis, Politecnico di Milano, 2013.

[16] G. Migliorati, F. Nobile, E. von Schwerin, and R. Tempone. Analysis of the discrete L^2 projection on polynomial spaces with random evaluations. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 14:419–456, 2014.

[17] A. Narayan and T. Zhou. Stochastic collocation on unstructured multivariate meshes. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 18(1):1–36, 2015.

[18] R. Platte and G. Klein. A comparison of methods for recovering analytic functions from equispaced samples. *in preparation*, 2016.

[19] R. Platte, L. N. Trefethen, and A. Kuijlaars. Impossibility of fast stable approximation of analytic functions from equispaced samples. *SIAM Rev.*, 53(2):308–318, 2011.

[20] E. A. Rakhmanov. Bounds for polynomials with a unit discrete norm. *Ann. Math.*, 165:55–88, 2007.

[21] A. Schönhage. Fehlerfort pflantzung bei Interpolation. *Numer. Math.*, 3:62–71, 1961.

[22] A. Shadrin. Twelve proofs of the Markov inequality. In *Approximation Theory: A volume dedicated to Borislav Bojanov*, pages 233–298. Professor Marin Drinov Academic Publishing House, Sofia, 2004.

[23] L. N. Trefethen. *Approximation Theory and Approximation Practice*. SIAM, 2013.